

Date: Tue, 18 Oct 94 04:30:17 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: List
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #495
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 18 Oct 94 Volume 94 : Issue 495

Today's Topics:

 Lamdas and others READ

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 18 Oct 1994 01:59:25 GMT
From: phantom@wwa.com (Leif Ericksen)
Subject: Lamdas and others READ

Well I have seen enogh of this debate over Gay or HOMOSEXUAL say
what it is do not try and make it better HAMS, and the ARRL.

There have been many disbutes over the ages of HOMOSEXUAL VS
HETEROSEXUAL. Personally I feel there always will be... AFTER all it
is an unnatural act, if it were not for the union of a man and womon there
would be no life.

MOST OFF WHAT PISSES me off is that we have a group where I am that
rips on the fags, or H0's as we call them. This got the goat of some
HOMOSEXUAL possibly a lambda and he called a member of the repeater at his
HOUSE AND THREATENED him his family (wife and children) with PHYSICAL
VIOLENCE, and bodily harm. This does your cause no good, and makes people
resent you even more. It did on the repeater I use....

History states people will hate the HOMOSEXUAL position, as people
may hate blacks, mexican, indians, asians, ETC...

The more you try and force people to believe in your lifestyle as being normal can cause greater problems thus in a sense you are helping by putting coals on people's fire of hate. Take a good look at your life does it really seem correct, do you have even the slightest twinge that something may be wrong if so investigate it further.

As for myself if a person CHOOSES to be HOMOSEXUAL, that is his/her choice. Just do not try and make me accept it for normal. I NEVER WILL. Most of all don't try and question me... IE are you sure that you won't, science said this here... sorry science has been wrong before, and it will be wrong several more times. Most of all do not ever try and say that you have to experience it then you will see it in a whole new light, or try and take me out for a date (hit on me) because if you do we have a bigger problem.

Some other things to consider: Gen 18, and 19; Leviticus 18:22; Romans 1:24-28; 1 Cor. 6:9-11. Think about that, yes they are Bible verses, maybe they are true as the whole Bible or maybe religion as a whole is a lie. I do not know and NEITHER do you. We will only know the TRUTH when we die. We can accept something as true but will not know 100% until we are dead.

I will admit I am far from perfect so is any person that desires to flame this message, so if you wish to flame it flame it if you agree, agree otherwise let it drift into cyber space and its death.

73,
Leif Ericksen
phantom@gagme.wva.com
phantom@ais.net

N9SRW

and bodily harm.

Date: 17 Oct 1994 21:01:32 -0500
From: mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini)

References<1994Oct13.142836.22507@lpi.liant.com> <37kfob\$4k@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<1994Oct17.194607.27017@arrl.org>
Subject: Re: ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

In article <1994Oct17.194607.27017@arrl.org>,
Ed Hare (KA1CV) <ehare@arrl.org> wrote:

>Dr. Michael Mancini (mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM) wrote:
>

>: The League has welcomed these "new" amateurs with open arms. And why not?
>: At \$30 a head, they represent some serious cash flow. Even though the

>: League is a non-profit organization, most of the officers at Newington
>: still draw handsome salaries.
>
>Belive what you will, but when I "welcome them with open arms" it is because
>I believe that ARRL needs to represent all of Amateur Radio or we will lose
>our effectiveness to represent any of it.

If your membership fees were reduced to \$15.00 a year, or even \$7.50 a year, do you think it would represent more of the amateur population? I realize that the bulk of the dues covers the expense of a subscription to QST, but I'm sure there are many people out there (such as me) who really aren't interested in that, but desire to become members.

Yes, I agree that the ARRL needs to represent "all" of amateur radio, but the truth is that it doesn't. Rather, it usually represents the majority of its membership, and often the League just represents the League.

Case in point: I was recently at a convention, in which I asked one of the League Directors a few questions. His first response to me was an inquiry as to whether I was a League member or not. When I said no, he promptly told me to stop wasting his time.

Now, I recognize that this probably doesn't represent the "official League HQ" feeling on this matter, but still, if you seek to represent all of amateur radio, you must LISTEN to all radio amateurs. Do you agree?

Date: 17 Oct 1994 20:38:36 -0500
From: mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini)

References<19940ct16.231935.28945@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> <37sr20\$9bi@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<19940ct17.130400.2817@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

In article <19940ct17.130400.2817@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:
>In article <37sr20\$9bi@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:
>>In article <19940ct16.231935.28945@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
>>Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> wrote:
>>>In article <37kg8f\$9bi@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:
>>>>I never said it was easy. In fact, it was difficult, and required hard work
>>>>and sacrifice on my part to achieve the 20 wpm element. But it can be done.
>>>>The reason there are so many Codeless Technicians out there today is a
>>>>direct result of the simplicity of the examination. When all one has to do
>>>>is memorize the answers to a question pool, there is no challenge.

>>>
>>>That begs the question of whether there *ought* to be challenge
>>>involved in getting government permission to use the airwaves.
>>>The government has an interest in maintaining order on the spectrum,
>>>but not in posing challenges for their own sake.
>>
>>We've already been down that road before, Gary.
>>It's called Citizen's Band. Would you want the
>>same for Amateur Radio? Be honest.
>
>No the alternate path is not Citizen's Band. That's the strawman
>argument you like to throw up as a smokescreen, that *effort* put
>into a hazing exercise somehow creates operators who are courteous,

A strawman argument? Not hardly. A call your attention to the third paragraph above, in which you question whether there SHOULD be a challenge involved in obtaining Government permission to use the airwaves. The Citizens Band Radio Service is a PRIME example of this. Here we have a personal radio service that requires NO effort to get into, and the results of this "bold experiment" only speak for themselves. As I said before, would you want the same for Amateur Radio?

"Hazing exercise?" Surely you can't be serious! Neither the Morse nor the theory requirements are hazing, any more than four years of college with a grade point average of 2.0 in order to earn a Bachelor's Degree. Hazing is more often equated with laziness, and the welfare mentality.

The real point, I believe Gary, is that this whole conversation is moot. We now have a class of license called the Codeless Technician tailored to those who are too lazy to enter Amateur Radio through the traditional licensing path. So, what is your point?

Date: Tue, 18 Oct 1994 03:11:47 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<781977526snx@skyld.grendel.com> <Cxq2KG.9M2@news.hawaii.edu>,
<37srgj\$6lp@eram.esi.com.au>
Subject: Re: The code debate....my view

dave@eram.esi.com.au (Dave Horsfall) writes:

> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:
>
>| 2. The riffraffs use SSB, not CW (no riffraffs on the low ends of the
>| bands).

>Tell that to the bozo sending abusive CW on 6m around here...

6M? He should be real easy to DF, Dave. So how do you folks handle
guys like him down in Australia?

Anyway, I meant the HF subbands; and I should have said 'few riffraffs'
(you get in trouble on here if you use absolutes...)

73 from the closest US state to Australia,
Jeff NH6IL

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #495
